CHURCH DIVINITY of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 3. JUNE, 1917. Vol. VII.

THE NEW DEAN OF CARLISLE.

The appointment of Canon Rashdall, D.Litt., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., to be Dean of Carlisle, has given unfeigned satisfaction to a large body of Liberal Churchmen, and specially to members of the Churchmen's Union, of whose executive he has been a leading member since its foundation.

Dr. Rashdall represents a type of clergyman less common in the English Church to-day than in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He is pre-eminently "a learned clerk," and from the days—now some forty years ago—when he was head-boy of Harrow, down to the present time, his abilities, interests and energies have been wholly devoted to the cause of sound learning.

A scholar of New College, Oxford, he graduated in 1881, winning the Stanhope Prize in 1879 and the Chancellor's English Essay in 1883, in which year he became a Lecturer at St. David's College, Lampeter. In 1884 he went to University College, Durham, as Chaplain and Tutor. In 1888 he left Durham to become Fellow of Hertford. In 1894 he was appointed Chaplain and Theological Tutor at Balliol, and next year returned to New College as Fellow and Tutor, becoming Dean of Divinity in 1903. Academic distinctions of various kinds, posts of labour as much as they were posts of honour, have marked his career. On many occasions he has been select preacher before the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. He has lectured in Scottish and American Universities. He has examined in "Greats" at Oxford, and

in Philosophy in the Royal University of Ireland. In 1891 Oxford awarded him the D.Litt.; Durham the D.C.L. in 1898; St. Andrews the LL.D. in 1911. He was Preacher at Lincoln's Inn 1898-1903, and Bampton Lecturer in 1915. In 1909 he was elected Fellow of the British Academy. During all this period he has been strenuously engaged as Student, Tutor, Lecturer, Preacher, Writer,—true to the type described by Chaucer five hundred years ago:—

> "A clerk there was of Oxenford also,
> That unto logic haddè long y-go.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> For him was liefer have at his bed-head
> A twenty bookès clad in black and red,
> Of Aristotle, and his philosophy,
> Than robès rich, ...
> Souning in moral virtue was his speech
> And gladly wolde he learn, and gladly teach."

While his intellectual interests are many-sided, it is to History, Ethics, and Theology that he has specially devoted himself, and has made his mark by work of outstanding merit in each branch of his *trivium*.

He began with History. His *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (in three volumes) published in 1895, placed him at once in the front rank of English historical writers. It is the standard work on the subject, and unhappy librarians who wish to secure it to-day make the unpleasant discovery that a second-hand copy commands a price considerably above that at which it was published. None who read it can fail to be impressed by its erudition, judicial tone, perfect lucidity and quiet humour. Students of history who know it and the same author's contributions to the *Dictionary of National Biography* will feel regret that Philosopy "and all her shadowy train" should have tempted Dr. Rashdall away from a sphere so eminently suited to his powers. Liberal Churchmen, however, have no cause to regret his devotion to theological and ethical studies, for it is that which has made him a tower of strength to the Broad Church party, both as teacher and controversialist.

His ethical *magnum opus*, *The Theory of Good and Evil* ols.) appeared in 1907. He dedicated this work to his chers T. H. Green and Henry Sidgwick, and his ethical tem may be regarded as a higher synthesis of their teaching. named it Ideal Utilitarianism, and it is characterised by ust English common-sense. This has been followed by ious smaller philosophical works, *viz.*, *Philosophy and ligion* (1909), *Is Conscience an Emotion?* (1914), *Conscience Christ* (1916).

Dr. Rashdall's theological *magnum opus* will undoubtedly his Bampton Lectures on the Atonement. Although vered nearly two years ago, they have not yet been lished, but they should mark as definite an advance in the glish exposition of that doctrine as did the great works of e and Moberley. Some of Dr. Rashdall's most notable ological teaching has been contributed to books of essays. "Ultimate Basis of Theism," contributed to *Contentio ritatis* in 1902; "Personality in God and Man," contributed *Personal Idealism* the same year; and an essay on the rigin of Evil," contributed to *The Faith and the War* in 5; expound in careful language the doctrine of limited nipotence to which Mr. H. G. Wells has recently given neous and popular enunciation. His Presidential Address he Aristotelian Society on philosophical objections to the aculous, deserves to be more widely known, as also a paper he ethics of subscription, and we venture to hope that he seek an early opportunity to make them accessible to the eral public.

educated laymen to-day feel an interest in thoughtful and cious expositions of Christian theology, Christian institus, and Christian morals, there are three of Dr. Rashdall's ks we would heartily commend to their attention.

—*Doctrine and Development* (1898).* This book consists ixteen University sermons, and is an "attempt to translate

* Methuem.

into the language of modern thought some of the lea doctrines or ideas of traditional Christianity." Its au protests against a notion which is becoming increasi popular, "that Religion is possible for reflecting minds wit a Theology;" and also against a charge often brought by opponents against Liberals "that liberal Theology means v and indefinite Theology." We venture to recommend one of the most suggestive and convincing of modern apol for orthodoxy.

II.—*Christus in Ecclesia* (1904) consists of sermons deliv in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn. It is an interpretation defence of Christian Institutions. While emphasizing essentially moral and spiritual character of the Chri religion, and the need for great watchfulness lest it shoul enslaved by legalism and ceremonialism, the preacher, lik judicious Liberals, recognizes the need and value of Chri institutions when used in subordination to the moral spiritual ideals which created them. He pleads most earn with Liberals not to stand aloof from the great institutio the English Church, but to use them with zeal, affection reverence, seeking ever to adapt them more and more t purposes for which they exist.

III.—*Conscience and Christ* (1916). This book deals fearless, modern way, with Christian principles of con Its author claims that any true representation of Christi must treat it as "a Religion rooted and grounded in Et and that "any doctrine of our Lord's Person which do base itself primarily upon the appeal which the teachi Jesus makes to the conscience of mankind, rests upo extremely precarious foundation." It is a plea fo authority of the moral consciousness to decide questi Christian conduct, and to interpret and apply magist the principles of Christ's teaching to modern moral culties. This claim can only be made, and indeed is only by one who believes profoundly that Christ did

His Gospel and practice the fundamental principles of
t conduct.

r. Rashdall's interest in ethics is by no means limited to
al exposition. He has been for years past a member of
Christian Social Union, and has given generous, but
tentatious, financial support to various forms of social
k. An ardent believer in the rightness of our cause in the
ent war, he enlisted as a volunteer and qualified as a
ksman, and has, of late, been engaged on work at the War
ce. An unflinching advocate of closer religious relations
Nonconformists, he gave whole-hearted assistance to the
iop of Hereford when he celebrated the United Communion
Iereford Cathedral at the time of the Coronation.

would have been pleasant to conclude this personal notice
the acknowledgment that the Church which Dr. Rashdall
served with such great ability, unfailing diligence, dis-
rested fearlessness, and moral courage for forty years had
efully recognised his services, and graciously given him
honour as it was in her power to bestow. Unfortunately
is not the case. Although of unblemished morality and
piety, no bishop had even made him an Examining
plain, or bestowed on him preferment of any kind, until
episcopal Nestor of Liberalism, the Bishop of Hereford,
inted him in 1909 to a stall in Hereford Cathedral, an
on which was bitterly criticized in fanatical Church circles,
has since rendered him open to malignant attack by certain
ions of the Church press. This long neglect was due
oubtedly to his fearless and original theological teaching.
saw the crying need for theological reconstruction to meet
demands of the age, and so attempted it with reverence
courage, scorning to veil his conclusions in fashionable
iguities and mysticalities. As a result he lay under the
utation of heresy—an unformulated charge as fatal to a
gyman's reputation as suspicion of his courage would be to
ldier. Unhappily the ill-effects are not limited to the

individual who suffers. If for an English clergyman proclaim the truth as research, reflection and conscie reveal it to him is to forfeit all prospect of promotion from Church authorities unless his expositions agree with traditio and popular views, then it becomes obvious that those v qualities will be suppressed in the clergy which are so grea needed to-day to enable the Church to win back the c fidence and adherence of the educated and intelligent clas It is for that reason, and not because of the hardship injustice experienced by an individual that we feel compel to draw attention to this aspect of Dr. Rashdall's car

If we are unable to congratulate our Church authorities recognising Dr. Rashdall's worth, at least we can congratul a Nonconformist Prime Minister on rectifying an injustice, the new Dean of Carlisle on his well-deserved promotion.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Smouldering Fires.

The Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* for April done no slight service to the Church of England by publish an important anonymous correspondence extending to th pages on "Dangers in the Church." We sincerely hope our rulers may read, reflect, and act, for the situatio becoming increasingly serious.

The dangers dealt with are due to excessive Romani All the letters make it clear.

> "That there is a definite policy, or in some cases indefinite, Romanize the Anglican Church that a large body will either force i communion with the 'See of Peter,' or if they cannot do that, will s and form a 'Uniat Church' in connection with the Papacy" (p. 4)

Although many educated Churchmen, Liberals especi have extended a judicious tolerance even to extreme A

Catholics, recognising that their zeal, and energy, and many-sided activities were a source of strength to the Church, and were undoubtedly able to win some to earnest Christian lives who might otherwise drift into indifference and unbelief, it is painful to learn that evidence is accumulating indicative of the exercise of a quite tyrannous intolerance by Anglo-Catholics in cases where they have the power to act in this way. This intolerance, oftentimes as unscrupulous as it is unfeeling, has borne most heavily upon the parochial laity who have too often looked in vain to their bishops for deliverance. In consequence many of the faithful laity have been practically excommunicated from their parish churches. This it will be said is an old story, the plaint of the Protestant layman. The point is not that it is an old story, and we may add, a true one, but that it has a sequel. The sequel is this, the tyranny is now being extended over the clergy. Clergymen who have conscientious difficulties about adopting "Catholic" customs are deliberately made extremely uncomfortable; their orthodoxy is suspect; and in certain cases they are forced to resign their positions.

Here is an instance cited in one of the letters:—

> "A clergyman who had worked for eleven years in one well-known mission was recently given the alternative by a Bishop of using a Litany addressed to the B.V.M. or resigning. He chose the latter, and left at once."

The writers of the letters call on the bishops to insist on liberty being maintained for all loyal Churchmen, and on the other hand by public speech, private exhortation, and the exercise of disciplinary action to check this deliberate Romanizing in the Church of England.

Incedis per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.

We confess that our faith in the ability of the episcopate to do this is small indeed. The real remedy is two-fold; (1) To give legal powers to the parochial laity, and (2) To educate the ordinands and younger clergy on broad and modern lines. The fate of the Church of England lies in these two things.

For us, the most significant of many significant passages in these valuable letters deals with "the great body of silent members of the Church of England," and the possibility of what some will regard as a Revolution, and others a Second Reformation, being brought about in the Church of England not by the Bishops but by "the great body of the silent members of the Church of England," acting through Parliament. This is the passage:—

> "There is a fashion to despise these people. I happen to have a very large acquaintance among them, and what strikes me first is what excellent people they are; very conscientious, most anxious to bring up their children well, quite loyal members of the Church of England; but the second point is that they are not ecclesiastical, and are extremely shy of expressing their opinion on ecclesiastical matters. They will put up with a very great deal for the sake of peace. . . . . They have an instinctive distrust of ecclesiastical agitation, and they do not like restriction of opinion; and this goes on for a long time, and then there is an unreasoning outburst of disgust. Twice in the history of the Church of England this has happened. . . . . There was a sudden reversal of everything in the Reformation. At a later period, just the same thing happened. For a long time they had to submit to what seemed the Laudian tyranny, and then, when an opportunity came, there was a great outburst of popular feeling against it. . . . . Unless our extremer friends are restrained, there may be very much the same sort of thing again in this country, if anything happens to stir it up. What people have felt has been the Kikuyu question—the barring of Nonconformists from our communion. They have felt very strongly, and there have been incidents in connection with the war which have emphasized the feeling. It is on some such point as this that there might be a very considerable movement, and the result might be to change the Church of England far more completely than either you or I would like. The combination of a desire for reunion, and the opposition of a great body of the laity to the extremer High Church views, and a feeling that the Bishops were not treating them fairly, might lead to a great body of people who are little represented in Diocesan Synods and Councils, but are very strongly represented in Parliament, taking the matter in their own hands, and changing the Church very considerably" (p. 15).

We commend these letters to the serious consideration of those well-intentioned Churchmen who wish to weaken the control of Parliament over the Church without first placing the power in the hands of the parochial laity; and also we venture to remind them of a very significant fact in the history of our

Church, that Church Reform has never been accomplished by the episcopate and the convocations, but only by the laity acting through Parliament.

Secularists and Liberals.

The Literary Guide and Rationalist Review of June makes a confession which our traditionalist brethren who regard the liberal clergy as the enemies and not the defenders of the Christian Religion may well take to heart. It says:—

> "Let Rationalists expose freely the absurdities of orthodoxy, but let them remember the high-minded and cultured liberal theologian is going to be their doughtiest opponent" (p. 80).

Our obscurantists and fanatics breed our secularists. A grossly superstitious and intolerant ecclesiasticism in France, and Spain, and Portugal, has produced a righteously intolerant secularism in those lands.

With the rising standard of education the need for separating the essentials of our religion from the crudities and absurdities to which it has been united becomes more and more urgent. Our traditionalist friends and our secularist friends are perfectly sure the separation cannot be effected. Both declare that it will kill Christianity. The liberals are like surgeons who must either perform dangerous operations or let their patients die. They feel the full force of Bishop Paget's saying: "To do nothing when you ought to be doing something is the height of rashness." The liberal's task is hard and dangerous, but he regards the programmes of the obscurantist and the secularist as impossibilities.

The obscurantist is really saying to the human intellect, "Darkness is better than light. Where truth conflicts with tradition, hold fast to tradition."

The secularist is really saying to humanity, "That which the human heart has been saying in many ways through all the ages is false. There is no God; there is no spiritual world; there is no future life."

Now there is no sound prospect of getting humanity t accept either of these propositions. The secularist sees, a does the liberal, the absurdity of the obscurantist's task, but h does not realise the impossibility of his own. Human being in their most vital and inspired moments are unable to accep the secularist attitude towards life. The student of religio knows the truth of Lucretius' famous line: *Tantum relligi potuit suadere malorum*, but he knows also that there is anothe side to the history of religion. In any case the liberal is certai that you can no more eliminate the religious than you ca eliminate the rational, moral, and aesthetic aspects of huma nature: *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.*

The liberal's task is therefore clear to him; it is to cultivat the noblest type of religion, and endeavour to extend it influence over humanity. This is no easy undertaking, an seems to demand for its fulfilment a constant succession o prophets, saints, and martyrs, but it must be done. Humanit cannot do with religion as it is; neither can humanity d without it.

The liberal sympathises with the secularist's detestation o superstition, obscurantism, and ecclesiasticism, but h remembers also a saying of Francis Bacon: "The Reason i not a dry light but suffers an infusion from the Will an Affections." If Reason were a dry light, and if man wer nothing more than Reason, the secularist must needs win in th end; but the secularist is up against the constitution of huma nature, and that may perhaps remind him of another o Bacon's sayings: "We rule nature by obeying her." It wiser then to study Religion, to learn her laws, and by obeyin them rule her for the good of humanity. It is a task of profoun difficulty but it is worth attempting. Religion is the inside o civilisation. A civilisation in its leading features is th reflection of its religion. A civilisation which is united to barbarous, or corrupt, or moribund religion is itself in the sam condition, and a civilisation divorced from religion does not exis

"Notice served on the Churches."

The Bishop of the Philippines in his inspiring sermon preached at S. Paul's on April 20th, on the occasion of the entry of the United States into the war, on behalf of Freedom, Humanity, and Peace, dealt in his peroration with the duty of Christian Churches to assist the promotion of universal peace by promoting ecclesiastical unity.

What the Bishop said is not new, but spoken on a historic occasion, it should come home with peculiar force to the Christian leaders in this country:—

> "Once more and finally: the soul of democracy is—I will not say religion—but organised religion. The day is passed for individualistic attempts to redeem mankind by visions that are not tuned to the infinite, the eternal and the universal. Only this morning I received a letter from a layman in America, a man who has done more for the unity of the Church of Christ than any other man of his generation, and this is what he says: 'It is, I think, becoming increasingly clear that the question of world peace and of Christian reunion go together, for only the visible unity of the Church of Christ will be competent to remove the obstacles in the way of the establishment of His Kingdom of peace and righteousness and love.' It is true. It is true. The world is craving for the unity that comes from God, and that is maintained by the operation of the Spirit of God. That unity is going to come just as fast as we will let God bring it to us; the only obstacle is our stubbornness, our obstinacy. There is—and here is the root of the matter—a Prussianism in the Churches to-day. The supreme unit of the Churches is the Church. The watchword of the Churches must be unity. Either Churches must justify their claim to be the favoured or exclusive residence of God by exhibiting in their works a holiness or a superiority nowhere now apparent, or else they must admit the favour of God towards other Churches of lesser pretensions. A large part of the public has already served notice on the Churches that, unless we observe the elementary principles of peaceableness and fairness and fellowship, they will get on without us. God defend us from the day when the sheep of Christ's flock turn upon the shepherds because of the shepherds' littleness and inability to be true leaders. But I see a vision, I see a great movement, a movement not of men but of God, coming sweeping through this world of ours and gathering into its embrace all right-minded, all true-hearted men. I see a united Church, a Church worthy of the residence of Jesus Christ among men, the shrine and instrument of His Spirit, a Church which will bring holiness and power to all the people of God,—that is the end of the vision, and that is the supreme thing to which we must commit ourselves to-day."

"The Foolishness of Preaching."

The *Church Times* has been declaring recently that "preaching is not necessary, and bad preaching is worse than useless." We are probably all agreed, except George Herbert and a few saints, that bad preaching is worse than useless, but the declaration that preaching is not necessary is dangerous and, when we have regard to the source from which it emanates, sinister. Preaching is the prophetic element in Christian worship, and has always been viewed with suspicion by priests and tyrants, whose object has been either to tune the pulpit as did our Tudor sovereigns, or to suppress it altogether. Yet a free pulpit is as necessary for the life of the Church as a free press is for the life of the Nation. Close observers of the Russian Church, including Bishop Bury, have held that the low standard of morality, both in priests and laymen, in that communion is due in part to the fact that the parish priest does not preach; he is not required to preach and he is not expected to.

The *Church Times* suggests that instead of preaching, books might be read from the pulpit. Of course, the *Books of Homilies* exist for that purpose. The *Church Times*, for reasons which they who know the Homilies will have no difficulty in divining, does not press for the Homilies but suggests the reading of *The Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man*. This was published in 1543, and will strike most modern men as being doctrinally somewhat out-of-date. Amongst other matters it deals with the use of the *Ave Maria*, and asserts the doctrine of transubstantiation. Our guileless contemporary is like the man of whom Latimer tells, who, aiming at a fox, slew his mother-in-law. It is not preaching, but Protestantism, that our contemporary is anxious to slay, and, on the plea that there is too much bad preaching, would like to suppress that progressive presentation of the Christian faith which ought to be the primary purpose of the pulpit. Of course, what our congregations need is good preaching, but

to give them none at all, or to read them a book of doctrinal exposition written 350 years ago, is no substitute for it. The pulpit should be the living voice of the living Church. A wider range of pulpit subjects, a freer method of treatment, and a much better educated and more up-to-date clergy, is what we need to improve the quality and interest of our pulpit teaching. This will not mean the exaltation of preaching above worship, but that the Church's direct appeal to conscience and intellect shall not be neglected in public worship.

Different parts of the service have different values for different sections of the congregation—some value the ritual most, others value the music most, others value the prayers most, others the preaching most, and the hearts of the churchwardens are set on the collection. The wise parish priest quotes to himself the poacher's maxim: "The more snares the more hares," and strives that each part of the service shall be as adequate as possible.

The movement for reducing preaching is no new one in the English Church, but it has never been viewed with favour by the laity, notwithstanding their sufferings. John Skelton, poet laureate, and tutor to Henry VIII., voices, in *Colin Clout*, one of the layman's grievances in his day:—

"The Temporalty say plain
How Bishops disdain
Sermons for to make,
Or such labour to take,
And, for to say troth,
A great part is for sloth;
But the greatest part
Is for they have but small art
And right slender cunning[1]
Within their heads wonning."[2]

It is to St. Paul[3] that we owe the curious phrase, "The foolishness of preaching." He perceived its apparent weakness and inadequacy to the great end in view, yet few men have ever believed in it more or used it with greater effect.

[1] Knowledge. [2] Dwelling. [3] 1 Cor. i. 21.

Trust the Laity.

The *Church Gazette* for May and June contains an able criticism from the Liberal Evangelical standpoint of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State. If it represents, as we believe it does, the general point of view of the Evangelical party, it might well serve as a basis for common action with Liberal Churchmen in regard to that Report.

The crucial point in the whole scheme, and the one, perhaps the only one, on which Liberals, Evangelicals, and Liberal Catholics should concentrate all their powers of attack, inviting if needs be the assistance of the Nonconformist leaders, is the Church franchise.

Who are the qualified electors in the parish? We give the reply in Dr. Dawson Walker's words.

> "They may be of either sex; they must be over twenty-one years of age; they must be either actual communicants, or possible communicants, in the sense that they must have been baptised and confirmed; and they must not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England.
>
> "This, it may be observed, is in effect a communicant franchise; it is exclusive rather than inclusive in character; it draws a sharp and impassable line between Churchmen and Nonconformist Christians. It is true that it is not strictly a communicant franchise; possibly, as the Bishop of Manchester suggests, because no one on the Committee had the courage to submit to the House of Commons so limited a constituency. But it is potentially a communicant franchise, and it explicitly excludes members of other Christian bodies even though they be baptised and professing Christians.
>
> "Now, in estimating this, it must be borne in mind that the proposals of the Committee amount to a re-establishing of the Church of England—on a somewhat different basis it is true—but still a re-establishing of it as the national Church of the English people, controlled in the last resort by the English Parliament. And seeing that this is so, I think it is greatly to be deplored that the possibility of a wider electoral franchise was not indicated; in other words, that an inclusive movement was not contemplated, and the whole question of our relation to the Nonconformist churches taken in hand. As the Dean of Canterbury has said:—
>
> "'The true attitude of the Church of England is to claim any Christian man within the country as properly a member of the Church of England, and to encourage him to maintain an interest in it as far as possible. After all, the position assigned to the Church in every parish

in the country gives it a great indirect influence in the whole life of the parish, and therefore upon the life of Nonconformists within it, and it would be the wisdom of the authorities of the Church rather to devise means for letting their voice be heard more than at present, than to be devising means for excluding it as much as possible.'

"The Bishop of Manchester, too, has given eloquent expression to the same heartfelt utterance of profound regret. He says:—

"'Did it occur to any of the Archbishops' Committee that the first step to spiritual independence in the Church of England was the restoration to its rightful position as the national Church? What efforts were made to consult the great Nonconformist leaders of England as to the feasibility of so noble a scheme?'

"These criticisms have all the more force, I think, because they come from men who have not been specially prominent before in advocating advances towards our Nonconformist brethren. All those, certainly, who feel that Christian unity, on the broad basis of devotion to Christ, is the crying need of the age, will share the disappointment that a 'middle wall of partition' has been erected by this electoral franchise, a wall such as never before existed between the Conforming and the Non-conforming members of the Church."

"Artifex," a Liberal Catholic, writing in the *Manchester Guardian* of May 3rd on "Democratic Rule in the Church," affirms that the underlying cause of the Church's failure is this:—

"The ruling powers in the Church, whether in the diocese or in the parish, do not trust the people or desire that they should be 'the real force behind' what is done. It is quite useless to expect any interest in the Church and her work on the part of the laity, so long as those who are asked to do that work and to supply the funds are, as the writer says, 'powerless to interfere or prevent what the vicar or rector of the parish may choose to do.'

"But even more strange and more tragic is the failure to realise that what is gained—or, I ought rather to say, what seems to be gained—in opposition to the will of the laity is not really gained at all, and even in its appearance of gain involves a far greater and more serious loss. After all, any teaching and any ceremonial which do not carry the laity along with them, are worse than useless. Doctrine and ceremonial are for the people, not the people for the doctrine or ceremonial. What can it possibly profit a clergyman or an ecclesiastical party to have gained all that he or it desires in the way of liberty of teaching or ceremonial if the laity are estranged from the Church?"

And here, perhaps, "Artifex" may not agree, and yet we think he will. The true policy of democracy is to make the franchise as wide as possible. For that reason the extension

of the Church franchise to all baptised adults who decla themselves to be members of the Church of England ought be the policy of the Church authorities. Education surely ma and ought to follow as well as to precede enfranchisement.

King Charles' Head.

The policy of Charles I. nearly brought about the extinctio of the Church of England, but there is serious reason f believing that his fatal influence is still with us. In th *Modern Churchman* of June, 1915, we reported Dean Hens as saying at the London Gathering of the Churchmen's Unio that:—

> "Two things, as significant as they were sinister, had been achiev by the Anglican Communion during this year of the war. The nam of King Charles I. has been inserted in the Church Kalendar. . . . example of solemn trifling in the presence of awful national respon bilities and duties. It seemed to indicate an inability on the part of t Anglican authorities to realise the present situation, an ineptitude whi might be compared with that of the official who on the eve of the Rei of Terror advised the starving Parisian populace to eat grass."*

Two years have passed since then, and incredible as it ma appear, Convocation still seems to be engaged with Charles This time the secular press seized upon the incident, and h condemned Convocation in no measured terms.

The *Sunday Chronicle* of May 6th, under the headi "Church Neros Fiddling whilst the World is Burning published an article evidently written by a Churchman wh wishes the Church well. We print the less strongly worded its paragraphs.

> "Every serious thinker admits that the Church of England is losi influence. Many good men regret the fact. Many others wonder w it is. There may be room for regret; there is no room for wonder any intelligent man who will read the proceedings of the Lower Hou of the Convocation of Canterbury just concluded.
>
> "If the evidence were not before his eyes no sane Englishm would believe that in these dreadful days an assembly of men alleged be educated could engage for hours in the appalling tomfoolery

*Vol. V., No. 3, p. 115.

discussing whether Charles I. should be restored to his position in the Church's calendar as a Black Letter Saint.

"What concerns me, as one who would like to see the Church of England great and powerful, is the amazing littleness of its leaders' minds in such times as these. It makes me wish that the State had bravely impressed the clergy into the war, just as France has done. Many of them would at least have been out of mischief.

"Consider the effect on the public mind. A world-wide war is in its third year of horror, involving a butchery of men unparalleled in man's history. All around us great problems, many arising out of the war, are ripening for solution—great problems of reconstruction, of relations between capital and labour, of infantile mortality, of the care of motherhood, of education, and the like—and in the burning heart and middle of this national emergency the Convocation of Canterbury busies its silly and anaemic brain with a squabble about whether we ought to put King Charles I. in the Prayer Book as a Saint and Martyr.

"A great cry has gone up to the Church to justify itself, to concern itself with the realities of life, and to make its influence for good felt in the Commonwealth. And that is the answer.

"'*The hungry sheep look up and are not fed.*'"

How are large measures of Church Reform to be passed by uch a body? Perhaps the personal influence of the Primate an secure their passage. If he cannot, we despair, not of Church Reform, that is bound to come, but of its coming in he constitutional way through Convocation.

It was the Earl of Clarendon, as devoted a Churchman as e was a great Statesman, who, mindful of the part that a mis-uided clerical policy played in the decapitation of Charles I., rote of the English clergy of that day:—

"They understand the least, and take the worst measure of human affairs, of all mankind that can write and read."

It might help to save the Church of England if the members f the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, even hough they cannot read the writing on the wall, would turn heir attention from King Charles' head to Clarendon's verdict.

It is the fashion in Church circles to attribute evil results to he eighteenth century silencing of Convocation. It is just ossible that it saved the Church of England.

SOME ASPECTS OF LIBERAL ZOROASTRIANISM.

By Alban G. Widgery, M.A., Professor of Philosophy and of the Comparative Study of Religions, Baroda.

Western scholars who have occupied themselves with a study of the teachings of Zoroaster have, almost without exception, accorded him one of the highest places amongst the religious leaders of mankind. Perhaps more than any other teacher he resembled the great prophets of Israel. The descendants of his disciples, the modern Parsis, exert, as has been justly said, an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. The object of this paper is not a systematic study of the frequently discussed problem how far the Parsis in their beliefs and practices agree with or differ from those of Zoroaster. Its aim is to bring into view the changes or reforms which those who may be called reformers urge against the adherents of tradition. The reformers claim that these changes are such as to bring the religion into more harmony with that of Zoroaster. One of the most usual cries of the reformer in all religions is the call to go back to the pristine purity of the teaching of the greatest teacher or founder, and discard the undesirable elements which have been assimilated in the course of the ages. The differences between the earliest and some of the later of the authoritative texts is patent to any serious student, and that the Parsis in India have assimilated Hindu and Muslim ideas and practices is not open to any serious doubt. In 1886 the burden of lectures given by Ervad Sheriaji Bharucha was therefore "Back to the Gâthas."

> "The Parsi religion of the day is anything but the pure religion promulgated by Zoroaster. Its purity and its true essence have been soiled and muddled by centuries of intolerant priest-craft."[1]

[1] C. M. Cursetjee in *The Journal of the Iranian Association*, iv., 1915, p. 88.

The first object of the Iranian Association is:—

"To maintain the purity of the Zoroastrian religion, and remove the excrescences that have gathered around it."[1]

The purpose of the Zoroastrian Conference (originated in 1910) is similar; its organisers wish to "inaugurate a liberal movement." It will not be enquired here whether the views expressed, and the attitudes adopted are those of many, few, or only one; it will suffice if they indicate the direction in which reform seems to lie. As yet, fortunately, there is no real schism between liberal and orthodox.

Very little is known with certainty of the details of the history of the Parsis in India since the time when, owing to the Muslim conquest of their native land, they migrated there in large numbers. As references in classical writings show, the religion of the Persians was a subject of interest to the Greeks. But in modern times the interest of Western scholars in them may be dated from 1771, when Anquetil de Perron published in Europe some translations of their sacred writings. It is, however, chiefly during the last sixty or seventy years that a large amount of research has been done by scholars in the West, such as Spiegel and Haug, Darmesteter and Tiele, Mills and Casartelli, Williams Jackson, and Moulton. During the same period the Parsis, who at the beginning of the nineteenth century were not known for any conspicuous attainments in education, have become one of the most enlightened peoples of India. Many are the schools, hospitals, and similar institutions in the Bombay Presidency due to Parsi enlightenment and charity. Genuine scholars have arisen amongst them such as Ervad Sheriaji Bharucha, K. R. Cama, J. J. Modi, and M. N. Dhalla who have devoted themselves to research on the texts of the sacred books, just as Malabari and Dadabhoi Naoroji gave their energies to combat social and political evils. Without fear of dispute it may be said that the movements for reform are intimately related to this growth of education, and the revival of intelligent study of the sacred

[1] *J.I.A.*, inside front cover.

writings of the religion, both of which are at least in part due to the influence of the West. For, conservatism in religion, whatever good it may contain, does in part depend upon ignorance; the experience of nearly all religions proves it. So among the Parsis, Ervad Sheriaji's

> "crusade for reform was the result of his sound scholarship."[1]

A definite step in the direction of the revival of serious interest in the religion was taken in the founding of two Madressas in Bombay where the members of the hereditary class of priests might study the sacred texts and the rites and ceremonies of their religion. Though these institutions have done good work, there seems to be a feeling at present that they have not kept pace, either in method or in spirit, with recent advances elsewhere.

> "There is not at present in the Madressas the faintest attempt at a historical or comparative treatment of the Mazda-Yasnian religion taken as a whole; much less at an appreciation of the fundamental principles of the religion on a philosophical and cultural basis."[2]

Most insistent and forcible demands are being made for a "cultured priesthood," with a good general education, a sound knowledge of their scriptures in their original and later languages, studied with the methods and aids of modern scholarship; with some training in philosophy and some knowledge of other religions. Along with these demands that the labourer should be worthy of his hire, is the recognition that his "hire" should be secure. The principle of fixed stipends for priests is strongly maintained, and efforts are being made in a few instances to provide such. Otherwise the priest is dependent chiefly upon offerings and the fees received for the performance of religious ceremonies. The standard of living of an educated man at the present time makes it a serious question for one to assume the office of priest in such precarious conditions, and many of those eligible for the priesthood have perforce taken up other careers.

[1] B. T. Anklesaria, *J.I.A.*, iv., 1915, p. 322.
[2] *J.I.A.*, iii., 1914, p. 176.

The requirements which the Parsi reformers demand from their priests and their religion are plainly seen from the statement:—

> "What we want from our Dasturs is an honest endeavour to show to those who desire guidance and help in these matters what are the essentials of Zoroastrianism, their value and their intrinsic rationality, and what on the other hand are the non-essential customs and observances which may have had their *raison d'etre* in the past but which have ceased to have any meaning in the present."[1]

Educated men and women of the present time are asking the meaning of customs and observances and the reason for beliefs, and so they cannot remain satisfied with priests who have little more than

> "a mechanical acquaintance with religious ritual as their only qualification."

We are told that

> "The faith of young Parsis is badly shaken in their ancestral religion."[2]

Yet this is not on account of indifference to genuine religious matters. For

> "it is true that they search for answers to their inquiries into the fundamental problems of existence and faith, in the writings of the best minds of the West, instead of their own religious texts."[3]

The vogue which, unfortunately, theosophy has had amongst certain sections of Parsis suggests on the one hand a need for modern scholarly views of their own religion, and on the other that there is an interest in spiritual ideals; for it cannot but be maintained that many of those misled by theosophy have been earnestly seeking religious light. Nevertheless, those who, just on account of their devotion to the true cause of the religion, have ventured on grounds of scholarship and reason to differ from their conservative brethren, have been accused of godlessness and indifference.

What is regarded by the reform Parsis as the source and basis of authority in matters of belief and practice? The shortest Zoroastrian profession of faith is:—

---

[1] *J.I.A.*, ii., 1913, p. 225.
[2] H. J. Bhabha. *J.I.A.*, i., 1912, p. 38.
[3] H. S. Spencer. *J.I.A.*, ii., 1916, p. 216.

"I am a worshipper of Mazda. I am a Zoroastrian worshipper o Mazda."[1]

This indicates that it is the religion as presented b Zoroaster, which it is meant to follow. But where is th authoritative account of this to be found? Careful researche of Parsi and of non-Parsi scholars all tend to the confirmatio of the view that there are

"hardly any genuine texts extant, except the Gâthas, embodying th original teachings of the founder of our faith."[2]

But while this gives something of immense positive value i the position it secures to the Gâthas, it does not aid much i deciding on the authority of those conceptions and observance included in the later Avestan and Pahlavi texts, but which ar not to be found in the Gâthas. It is not surprising therefor to be told of a

"loss of the authority of the scriptures."[3]

The further question has also proposed itself: Is the teachin of Zoroaster a revelation from God, and if so, in what sense o the term revelation? The subject has not been very muc discussed in print. The extreme view that

"the religion of Zarathustra is not a revelation in the sense in whic that term is used in Theology," is maintained by Mr. D. M. Madan.[4]

By revelation the writer chiefly means

"the instilling of knowledge or wisdom in a mysterious manner from a external source to some chosen human being."

He contends that the Zoroastrian system of philosophy take as a whole implies that Ahura Mazda created the world an placed it under the domain of immutable law. This law ac as a "restrictive force on the omnipotence of God," and i precise nature is opposed to the actuality of any such revelatio as that mentioned.

"According to the teaching of Zarathustra it is given to ma and perfectly within his competence to understand fully the la governing the universe, and to work out the salvation of man by mutu help and division of labour. The part that Zarathustra played in t world was this—that he, having understood thoroughly the philosop

[1] *Yaçna*, xii., 8.
[2] H. S. Spencer, *J.I.A.*, ii. 1913, p. 216. [3] p. 217.
[4] *J.I.A.*, ii., 1913, pp. 255-260. *Is the Religion of Zarathustra a Revealed Religion.*

and system of the world, was prepared wholeheartedly to devote himself to promulgate the same in the world."[1]

Thus, whatever may be the verdict of scholars on the disputed question as to whether the sacred texts make a claim that Zoroaster received a revelation from Ahura Mazda (a claim they do *seem* to make) here at least is a modern opinion which may ultimately be accepted that the truths Zoroaster taught were attained by him through the exercise of his reason and conscience, which are divine gifts to men as men.

Trained to trust his reason and conscience in non-religious matters, the modern man insists that the same tests shall also be applied in religion. The second Annual Report of the Iranian Association states:—

"We stand above all for truth and reason."

While it is desirable to go back to the primitive purity of Zoroaster's teaching, the principles of religion also need to be formulated in intelligible modern terms, such as may arouse reverence in young and old.

"The expansion of the old fundamental doctrines and the formation of a superstructure suited to modern times are what are wanted now."[2]

The central faith in monotheism and in righteousness remains; but otherwise the religion must progress according to the requirements of the times. "More stress is to be placed on the spirit than on the letter."

The spirit of the religion and some of its leading doctrines, as they present themselves to the mind of a liberal Parsi, may be illustrated by a few quotations from a paper by Mr. Byramjee Hormusjee, entitled "The Creed of Zarathustra":—

Zoroastrianism "teaches belief in one God, Ahura Mazda, just, merciful, eternal and infinite in wisdom, unchangeable in purpose, and adorable in majesty; ineffable in perfection, for ever blessing and for ever blessed."[3]

"It teaches belief in a reign of law which is the reign of love. It teaches that man is created by Ahura Mazda: that by him man is thoroughly known, righteously judged, and graciously loved."[4]

[1] D. M. Madan, *J.I.A.*, ii., p. 259.
[2] *J.I.A.* [3] *J.I.A.*, ii., 65. [4] p. 65.

Life should be a co-operation with God in the conflic against evil and in the production of the good. The goo soul will share in the final triumph and in immortality. Wha a man sows that shall he reap: if he sows with penitence an sorrow for past wrongs, he shall reap the joy of the higher li he strives for.

> Zoroastrianism "teaches that the whole world is moving towar the fulness of God's glory, and that He is ever reconciling the whc world to Himself."[1]
>
> "It teaches belief in Heaven and Hell. These are conditio rather than localities. Heaven is a condition of self-balance, harmo and happiness, and it is attained now through obedience to natural law The heaven is within the good and pure-minded; hell is within t impure, the angry, and the depraved. Its principle meaning is sorro trouble, regret, and bitter galling remorse. It teaches that compensati is certain. Ahura Mazda has created no hells. Man is the architect his own hell as of his own heaven."[2]
>
> "Finally, it teaches belief in prayer and in the power of praye It teaches that true prayer is aspiration, an outgoing, an uplifting of t soul's emotions to all that is just, good, and divine. Prayer must acted. The ecclesiastic sectarist—the dastur—prays to an unchangeab God to send rain in a season of drought, while the philosopher prays irrigating the fields. Man grows to be like what he thinks abou Aspirational prayers transform us into the moral likeness of those whom we pray."[3]

Researches in the sacred writings with the aid of philolog seem to point to a misunderstanding with regard to the teachi concerning the soul after death. The reformers

> "said that Zoroastrianism enjoined that a man went to the abode weal or woe according to his deserts, and that no amount of ceremoni performed by the living could either mitigate his sufferings or impro his condition in the spiritual world."[4] Anniversary ceremonies, it suggested, are for the benefit of those who remain more than for that the dead. Zoroastrianism is held not to admit of the idea of expiati or vicarious salvation in any form.[5]

In consequence, modifications of the expensive ceremoni performed for the honour of the departed are advocated.

It is well known that fire is held in great reverence Parsis; indeed, they are often known in the West by t

[1] p. 65. [2] p. 66. [3] p. 66.
[4] Dr. Dhalla, *Zoroastrian Theology*, New York, 1914, p. 348.
[5] See Dr. Dhalla *l.c.* and p. 349. At present I myself doubt this view.

inaccurate description of "fire-worshippers." The enlightened Parsi, whether conservative or liberal, usually regards fire simply as a sacred symbol. That is one reason why he does not cremate his dead. Signs of change of attitude are, however, not lacking, though at present they are very slight. "Concrete objects," we are told, have ceased to symbolise for us our ideas in matters religious. A lady at the Zoroastrian Conference

> "criticised the practice of bowing before the sacred fires."[1]

Along with this has gone a general protest against the effect of a mechanical performance of ritual, now largely unintelligible, which is all too often made a substitute for righteousness and spirituality.

The language used by the priests in their religious ceremonies is that of the sacred texts from which the related passages have been taken. These languages are often mispronounced, and to all but a few scholars are quite unintelligible. Prayers in conservative practice are mainly passages of the sacred writings, whether understood or not by those who pray. Such prayers are condemned by the liberals as giving no adequate expression to religious feelings and convictions.

> "A prayer that had no subjective value is no prayer. It failed to awaken any ethical fervour, for a truly devout prayer should spur the spirit within, to a higher life. This was not possible so long as the priest perfunctorily droned prayers, not a word of which was understood."[2]

It is almost impossible to believe that any person who prays should be able to limit himself to such phrases. That demands should have been made for services in the vernacular is not surprising. Scholars, especially Ervad Sheriarji, proved that the practice had been prevalent in the past. Prayer meetings were therefore held, followed by sermons, both the prayers and the sermons being in the vernacular, Cujarati. At the Zoroastrian Conference it was proposed that a book of common prayer should be compiled, but this proposal has not yet been carried out, although the need has been repeatedly expressed for many years. Sacred hymns were composed in Cujarati,

[1] *J.I.A.*, iv., 1915, p. 133. [2] Dr. Dhalla, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

and an effort was also made to introduce singing with a choir to the accompaniment of music into worship, but its success was only temporary, the conservative opposition having proved too great, although it was pointed out to the conservatives that the Gâthas, the most ancient, and probably the most authentic of the sacred books are hymns.

The private and practical revolt against certain purificatory rites and other observances has probably been much greater than its public and theoretical expression. The practice of rubbing bull's, cow's, or she-goat's urine, on the hands, face, and feet, is opposed to all modern ideas of cleanliness, and is in itself repulsive. It is more likely to be a cause of irritation than a purifying agent. Although an injunction in the Vendidad (a later writing) orders the practice, the spirit of Zoroastrianism, for which purity in all its forms is a fundamental idea, is against it. Some, following a suggestion by Haug, think that the command is due to a misunderstanding of a poetical expression, meaning the rain from the clouds, the clouds being poetically called cows. One of the reasons given by a Parsi lady for her conversion to Christianity was that she could not be persuaded out of the belief that the practice was necessary for a Parsi, unless an authoritative pronouncement were made to the contrary by the priests of the community. This, of course, she did not obtain. It is worthy of note that there is not any mention of it in the Gâthas. Other customs, equally unrelated to spiritual religion, but possessing external traditional religious sanction, are also being discontinued, such as the isolation of women at certain times, and some of the rules relating to women at the time of child-birth. Child marriages, and restrictions of the liberty of women, due probably to the influence of Hindu and Muslim customs, have now generally been discarded, and the standard of culture and liberty of Parsi ladies is relatively high. The use of well water for ceremonial purposes, irrespective of its condition, is also discountenanced. The mode of disposal of the dead, by

exposing them in the towers of silence to be eaten by vultures, is not without its modern critics. And Mr. G. K. Nariman says the verdict of history is not unanimous that

> "we as a community religiously adhered to the practice in all parts of Iran under the national rulers."[1]

Recent discussion shows that the community is rigidly exclusive: proselytes are not desired, and would not generally be accepted. The attitude of liberals is a little more elastic than that of conservatives. I have not entered into a consideration of the grounds put forward in justification for this attitude, though it appears to be more due to conditions of caste life in India than to anything else. But even if the Parsis will not definitely accept into their community persons not born Parsis, the duty is nevertheless clear that the adherents of a religion which contains so much good, should with its inspiration, do what they can to help in the uplifting of the depressed classes around them.

The cause of reform has been hindered in more recent times through the spreading of an idea in India, by men who wish to be regarded as patriots, that Western education is in spirit secular, if not actually materialistic, and tends to harm the spirituality of those who are brought up under it. Associating themselves to some extent with this idea, the Theosophists for a time succeeded in making some progress amongst the Parsis. Theosophists have been the worst opponents of genuinely religious and scholarly reform, in that they have striven to justify superstituous practices and beliefs by occult interpretations, which, however absurd, are by their very nature as incapable of disproof as of proof. The Iranian Association has already done much good service on behalf of reform against this opponent. With the steady advance of scholarship and education amongst the priests and leaders of the community, the further growth and the future triumph of the liberal attitude amongst the Parsis generally, is hardly open to doubt.

[1] *J.I.A.*, ii., 1913, p. 99.

THREE SERVICES REVISED.

By the Editor.

Thoughtful and earnest parish priests who have listened for years past to discussions on Prayer Book revision, are aware that it is not the daily, but the occasional, offices which stand in most need of revision.

This need is of a most serious character in the case of the office for the Public Baptism of Infants. Indeed, it is mainly due to the unsuitability of our present service that public baptism has so largely fallen into disuse, and is so often celebrated under circumstances which are unworthy of that sacrament.

The chief objections to our present service for the Public Baptism of Infants, are that it is unnecessarily long, and seems at certain critical points to lack grip and intelligibility for the average layman. Its opening question is a bad start; its references to Noah and his ark, and to the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea, sound strangely archaic to modern ears; its exhortations and addresses lack simplicity and directness; its prayers are too numerous; and their language, in certain cases, too technical. Above all, the fact that sponsors (who, now-a-days, often include the parents) make promises in the name of the child, but do not themselves promise that they will bring the child up as a Christian, means that the Church fails at the critical moment to secure that very guarantee from responsible persons which makes infant baptism justifiable and profitable.

The following revised Baptismal Service is a humble endeavour to meet the difficulties of the situation. The reviser has made large and grateful use of the rich materials of our present office, but has not hesitated to transpose and excise. Other sources have been drawn upon, but in a sparing, and it is to be hoped, judicious manner. While in the revised service

certain ambiguous and controverted phrases will be found to have disappeared altogether, yet nothing essential to the valid administration of the sacrament, nor even anything of first-class liturgical value in our present baptismal service has been excluded, although the new service is but half the length of the old. The omission of the Apostles' Creed is not a novelty on the part of the present reviser, but was adopted some years ago by the American Church.

The revised Baptismal Service requires no alterations in the Confirmation Service, and only a very slight alteration in the Catechism, *viz.*, in the answer to the third question in the opening section.

The two other occasional services revised are those most frequently attended by people who seldom attend any other Church services. It is therefore particularly important, if for no other reason, that these services should be free from certain features which, without adding any essential value to the services, often provoke hostile or puzzled criticism at the present time. When such features can be eliminated without any real loss to Christian faith, worship, and morals, it is the positive duty of the authorities of the Church to accomplish it. In the revision of these two services, various precedents have been followed, but the reviser is under large obligations to the American Prayer Book, and to that admirable liturgical effort, *A Prayer Book Revised,* with a Preface by the Bishop of Oxford. He is also indebted to the Bishop of Knaresborough for sound advice and valuable suggestions.

I.—PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

All standing at the Font, the Minister shall say:—

Hear the words of the Gospel, written by Saint Mark, in the tenth chapter, at the thirteenth verse.

They brought young children to Christ, that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little

child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them.

Beloved, ye hear in this Gospel the words of our Saviour Christ, that He commanded the children to be brought unto Him; how He blamed those that would have kept them from Him; how He exhorted all men to follow their innocency. Ye perceive how by His outward gesture and deed He declared His good will towards them; for He embraced them in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favourably receive this present infant; that He will embrace him with the arms of His mercy; that He will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of His everlasting kingdom.

Let us pray.

Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all who flee to Thee for succour, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead; we call upon Thee for this infant; receive him, O Lord, as Thou hast promised by Thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask, and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: So give now unto us that ask; let us that seek find; open the gate unto us that knock; that this infant may enjoy the everlasting benediction of Thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which Thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The Minister addressing the Parents and Godparents shall say:—

Dearly beloved, by bringing this child here to be baptized you have signified your desire that he should become a Christian.

Will you then faithfully and earnestly teach this child to renounce all evil?

Answer:—I will.

Will you diligently instruct him in the faith of Jesus Christ?

Answer:—I will.

Will you exhort him both by precept and example to keep God's Holy Will and commandments, and to walk in the same all the days of his life?

Answer:—I will.

Let us pray.

O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in this child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him. *Amen.*

Grant that all carnal affections may die in him, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him. *Amen.*

Grant that he may have power and strength to have victory, and to triumph, against the devil, the world, and the flesh. *Amen.*

Almighty, everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of His most precious side both

ater and blood, and gave commandment to His disciples, that they should o teach all nations, and baptize them in the Name of the Father, and of the on, and of the Holy Ghost; regard, we beseech Thee, the supplications of hy congregation; consecrate this water to the mystical washing away of in, and grant that this child now to be baptized therein, may receive the ilness of Thy grace, and ever remain in the number of Thy faithful and lect children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Rubrical directions as in our present Prayer Book Service.

Name this child.

N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of he Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock, and do sign im with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be shamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner, against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's aithful soldier and servant unto his life's end. *Amen.*

Let us pray.

Our Father (with doxology).

We yield Thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased hee to receive this infant into Thy holy Church. And humbly we beseech hee to grant, that he may be brought up to lead a godly and a Christian fe, and may follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like nto Him, that as He died and rose again for us, so may we all who are aptized die from sin and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying ur corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of ving, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

All standing up, the Minister shall say:—

Dearly beloved, you have promised that you will train this child to be a hristian, I therefore exhort you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, the over of little children, that ye fail not in this your promise. Earnestly ndeavour, I beseech you, to fit yourselves for the faithful discharge of your uty in this matter, and let your daily life be such that this child may ever ook on you with love and reverence, and learn the lessons of true religion rom your life as well as from your lips. Ye are to take care that this child e brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him so soon as he has been uly instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose.

II.—MARRIAGE SERVICE.

Processional. Psalm lxvii. or a wedding hymn.

The Priest addressing all present shall say:—

Dearly beloved, we are gathered here in the sight of God to join ogether this Man and this Woman in holy Matrimony; which is an

honourable estate, and not by any to be taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God. Into which holy estate these two persons present come now to be joined. Therefore, if any man can show any just cause why they may not lawfully be joined together, let him now speak, or else hereafter hold his peace.

The Priest addressing these to be married shall say:—

I require and charge you both, as ye will answer at the dreadful day of judgment, when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed, that if either of you know any impediment, why ye may not be lawfully joined together in Matrimony, he do now confess it. For be ye well assured, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow are not joined together by God; neither is their Matrimony lawful.

The Priest shall say unto the man:—

N. wilt thou have this Woman to thy wedded wife, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou love her, and comfort her, honour, and keep her in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all other, keep thee only unto her, so long as ye both shall live?

Answer:—I will.

The Priest shalt say unto the woman:—

N. wilt thou have this Man to thy wedded husband, to live together after God's ordinance in the holy estate of Matrimony? Wilt thou love him, and comfort him, honour, and keep him in sickness and in health; and, forsaking all other, keep thee only unto him, so long as ye both shall live?

Answer:—I will.

Rubrical directions as in our present Prayer Book Service.

Who giveth this Woman to be married to this Man?

I N. take thee N. to my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death do us part, according to God's holy law; and thereto I plight thee my troth.

I N. take thee N. to my wedded husband, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death do us part, according to God's holy law; and thereto I give thee my troth.

With this ring I thee wed, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

Let us pray.

Our Father (with doxology).

O Eternal God, Creator and Preserver of all mankind, Giver of all spiritual grace, the Author of everlasting life; Send thy blessing upon these thy servants, this man and this woman, whom we bless in thy Name; tha

ey may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made, d ever remain in perfect love and peace together, and live according to y laws; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Then shall the Priest join their right hands together, and say:—

Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder.

Forasmuch as N. and N. have consented together in holy wedlock, and ve witnessed the same before God and this company, and thereto have ven and pledged their troth, each to the other, and have declared the same giving and receiving a Ring, and by joining hands; I pronounce that they Man and Wife together, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, bless, preserve, and ep you; the Lord mercifully with his favour look upon you, and fill you th all spiritual benediction and grace; that ye may so live together in this e, that in the world to come ye may have life everlasting. *Amen.*

A hymn and marriage address may here follow, or instead of the latter e Minister may read 1. Cor. xiii. 1 to end.

Recessional. Psalm cxxviii.

If there be a Celebration of the Holy Communion, Psalm cxxviii. shall rve as the Introit; the Collect used shall be that for Quinquagesima;* the pistle, 1 Cor. xiii.;* the Gospel, S. Mark x. 2 to 9.

III.—BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

Rubrical directions as in our present Prayer Book Service.

I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in e, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and lieveth in me shall never die.—St. John xi. 25, 26.

In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would ve told you, I go to prepare a place for you.—St. John xiv. 1, 2.

The path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more to the perfect day.—Prov. iv. 18.

The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no rment touch them.—Wisdom iii. 1.

Psalm xxiii.—*The Lord is my Shepherd;* or Psalm xc.—*Lord, Thou hast n our refuge;* or Psalm cxxx.—*Out of the deep.*

Lesson.—1 Cor. xv. 20 to end (the whole or any part); or 2 Cor. iv. to d; or 2 Cor. v. 1-4. or Rev. xxi. 1-7; or Rev. xxi, 23-27.

Psalm cxxxix. 1-18.—*O Lord, Thou hast searched me out*; or hymn.

* The word *love* is to be read instead of *charity*.

Let us pray.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

The Lord's Prayer.

Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart henc in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivere from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity, so teach us to numbe our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, that we, with all thos that are departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, may have our perfec consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlastin kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

Psalm xlii. 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, or a hymn may be sung in church, or as the approach the grave.

When they come to the grave the minister shall say:—

In the midst of life we are in death; of whom may we seek for succou but of Thee, O Lord. Thou knowest, Lord, the secrets of our hearts; shu not Thy merciful ears to our prayer; but spare us, Lord most holy, O Go most mighty; O holy and merciful Saviour, Thou most worthy Judge eterna suffer us not, at our last hour, for any pains of death, to fall from Thee.

The minister shall commit the body to the grave with these words:—

Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto Himself th soul of our dear brother here departed, we therefore commit his body t the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; in sure and certai hope of the Resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Then shall be said or sung:—

I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, From hencefort blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: even so saith the Spirit; fo they rest from their labours.

Or,

Lord, Thou hast been our refuge: from one generation to anothe Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the wor were made: Thou art God from everlasting, and world without end.

Let us pray.

*O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is th Resurrection and the Life; in whom whosoever believeth, shall live, thoug he die; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in Him, shall not die eternall who also hath taught us, by His holy Apostle Saint Paul, not to be sorr

*N.B.—At the discretion of the minister, this prayer may be said in the church after t prayer, "Almighty God with whom do live."

as men without hope, for those who sleep in Him, we humbly beseech Thee to comfort the bereaved, supply their manifold needs, and grant them to know that all things work together for good to them that love Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

*O Father of all, we pray to Thee for those whom we love but whom we see no longer. May they ever be learning more of Thy love; may Thy light shine upon them; may they be enfolded in Thy peace and filled with Thy joy. We pray for all who have passed through the grave and gate of death. Do Thou in Thy loving wisdom and almighty power work in them the good purpose of Thy perfect will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Unto God's gracious mercy and protection we commit you. The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you now and for evermore. *Amen.*

At the Holy Communion following, the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for All Saints' Day may be used.

A MODERN CONFESSION OF FAITH.

Confessions of Faith are always interesting to those who are really interested in humanity. But confessions of faith are of two kinds, official and personal. The *Nicene Creed* is an example of the first, Rousseau's *Confession du Vicaire Savoyard* is an example of the second. To the first, the church historian gives all his attention, but it is the second in which the psychologist is interested. The first are the composition of many, and are products of compromise. They strive to express the religious belief of a community, and those communities are wisest whose creed is short and simple. The creed of Islam is a model in that respect. "There is but one God, and Mohammed is His prophet." Had Christianity not fallen into the hands of dialectical Greeks, we Churchmen might have had a three-line official creed to day, and peace upon Israel. Howbeit the end is not yet. To those who are not willing *jurare in verba magistri* belongs the privilege of composing their own personal creed. It often has the disadvantage that nobody can say it truly except its composer, but it is this which gives it its peculiar value for the psychologist. It is the perfect mirror of the religious consciousness of a human soul. Usually the man who formulates his

* N.B.—At the discretion of the minister, this prayer may be said in the church after the prayer, "Almighty God with whom do live."

confession of faith has but little reverence and affection for official creeds. If he is not an egoist at least he is one who thinks for himself. Such is Mr. H. G. Wells in his recently published confession of faith, *God the Invisible King*.[1]

It has taken a world war to do for Mr. Wells, what Clough described lesser woes as doing for lesser men.

> "Almost everyone when death
> Disease or sorrow strike him
> Inclines to think there is a God
> Or something very like Him."

This has grieved Mr. Wells' secularist friends, but has given unfeigned joy to religious proselytizers. To students of religion it will cause no surprise. They know that atheists are far fewer than is generally supposed, but heretics infinitely more numerous. Mr. Wells, however, is resolved to give no room for satisfaction to the orthodox officials of the Christian Church. He begins by asserting strongly that his religion "is not orthodox Christianity;" "indeed it is not Christianity at all." It seems to us that all that is best in Mr. Wells' religion is Christian. What the late Stopford Brooke wrote of Shelley is true of Mr. Wells in *God the Invisible King*.

> "When he is floating on his wings . . . his hatred of Christianity is lost in enthusiastic but unconscious statement of Christian conceptions."[2]

It is true that his Christianity is not orthodox, but he is after all not a formal heretic. He has never studied and understood the great masters of Christian doctrine, and then deliberately rejected their creed. His theological knowledge is of that brilliant and treacherous kind displayed by Professor Haeckel in his *Riddle of the Universe*, which provoked his fellow-professor Loofs, the ecclesiastical historian, to deal with him as only one German professor can deal with another who has broken the eleventh commandment. Mr. Wells' remarks about the fourth century origin of the Apostles' Creed, the poorness of the mental quality of the Church's leaders in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, the lack of freedom and originality which marks the writings of Origen, will seem grotesque to students of these things. *Non omnes omnia possumus*, we cannot be masters in every department. Mr. Wells has his pre-eminence as a brilliant, emotional writer and social critic, but as an interpreter of Church History he lacks knowledge, insight, reverence, and sympathy. If Mr. Wells had the knowledge of a Gwatkin, the sympathy of a Glover, the judicial mind of a Lecky or a Dill, combined with his own brilliancy and enthusiasm, he would indeed be worth reading when he attempts to interpret the history of the Christian Church or to estimate the significance and value of her creeds, but under present circumstances the result of his journalistic excursion into that department may be disregarded. But this, we are glad to think, can be done without in the least detracting from the value of his message in *God the Invisible King*.

---

[1] *God the Invisible King*, by H. G. Wells, price 6/- net. Cassells, 1917.

[2] *Theology in the English Poets*, p. 2, Everyman's Library.

Mr. Wells stands forth in this book as the prophet and apostle of "Creedless Faith," of "Religion without Theology," This is the natural and proper re-action from a surfeit of theology in our religion, and, not a little of it, theology which is hopelessly out of date. We venture to think that if Mr. Wells would re-write his book in the form of a tract, and omit all direct references to Christian theology, and also all attempts at constructing a theology of his own, and would simply tell his countrymen or his fellow human beings all the globe over, that he has found God, and all that that experience means to him, and may mean to them, not only personally, but socially and politically, he would be doing no inconsiderable service. It seems to us a pity that one who has such a mission to discharge should be in any degree negative and iconoclastic. Mr. Wells confesses in one place that his new faith has closer affinity with Mohammedanism than with Christianity. It is in his desire to smash idols, rather than to begin as Jesus did with the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, that we see this affinity most distinctly.

Like many before him, Mr. Wells has not found God in Nature, nor in the churches, but in his own heart. For Mr. Wells, as for the Gnostics, there are two Gods. The Creator, "the God of the starry heavens above me," and the Redeemer, "the God of the moral law within me." The two may have something to do with each other, but Mr. Wells cannot feel sure that they have. In any case, he is only concerned with the latter. Those who need a theology are hardly likely to be satisfied with a dualistic theology of this sort, and those who do not need a theology can dispense with it. But for all practical purposes our new apostle is right. To secure salvation it is infinitely better to seek God as manifested in the human heart, than to seek Him as manifested in nature, and that because the Divine Revelation in the human reason and conscience is higher and more intimate than the Divine Revelation in nature. But is it not possible to combine both revelations, as did Wordsworth, and believe in One God?—

> "Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."

We do not wish to wax theological, but would only urge that if Marcion in the second century felt that the Creator-God of the Old Testament, the Jehovah of the Hebrews, was an entirely different and inferior Deity to the Father of Jesus Christ, it did great credit to his Christian consciousness, and no discredit to his reason, for the conception of a progressive creation and a progressive Divine revelation had not been clearly recognised then as the solution of the problem. But those who have lived since the rise of Darwin and the evolutionists, are not placed in the dilemma in which Marcion found himself, and are not driven to his Dualism. God revealed in nature and in history and in conscience is one, but the degree and fulness of the revelations vary. The lesson of the Incarnation is that the highest form ol the Divine

revelation for humanity must be looked for not in nature, but in a perfect human personality.

"There may be other words for other worlds,
But for this world the Word of God is Christ."

A weakness of Mr. Wells' book is that he is too much inclined to regard his own religious experience as the measure of all religious men's experience. He needs to develop and adjust his own experience by reference to those of the supreme religious personalities in human history. But after all, Mr. Wells does right to emphasize and speak forth his own convictions. "We can but speak that which we have seen and heard." It is the positive duty of the prophet to do so, and we respect the courage and faith which Mr. Wells has shewn in speaking out as he has done.

Mr. Wells' message is the utterance of elemental religious emotion. There is a God; I have found Him; He has found me; with that finding has come salvation; I am delivered from the disharmonies of life; from the tyranny of things; I have hope; I have joy; I have moral strength; I have a purpose; I have a unity in my life which were not mine before. Salvation for Mr. Wells has two sides; it is finding God and losing oneself. It is the same in the Gospel of Jesus. Mr. Wells puts it in modern language but fundamentally there seems to us to be no difference. "Whosoever wills to lose his life for My sake, the same shall find it."

Mr. Wells thus expresses the mission of the man who has found God. He is "a knight in God's service." His duty is "The identification of the individual life with the immortal purpose of God;" "Devotion to the racial adventure under the captaincy of God." Some will prefer the old Christian form: "Thy Will be done," or St. Paul's phrase: "fellow-workers with God." It matters little, however; loyalty to God is the ideal of life.

Mr. Wells' views of the relation of magic, providence, and quietism to his religion are those of our Saviour. Christ's Gospel knew nothing of magic; it was essentially moral and spiritual. Christ never promised to His disciples immunity from disease or death or physical disaster. The falling of the tower of Siloam was no evidence of Divine disapproval; the falling of rain no special blessing reserved only for the just. The Heavenly Father is conscious of human suffering, and realises human needs, but His supreme gift to His children is the Holy Spirit. As for quietism, it is but one side of the Gospel which is essentially active and social.

God, says Mr. Wells, is not dietary and hygienic and sexual, *i.e.*, He has laid down no hard and fast rules in these matters, each must act in accordance with his conscience: so said Jesus also. Conduct in these things must be entirely subordinated to the supreme reality of the religious life. It is here that Mr. Wells is so intensely Christian in his ideal of conduct and its relation to religion. He writes:—

> "Relationship with God is the supreme relationship: It is difficult to imagine how the association of lovers and friends can be very fine and close and good, except the two who love are each also linked to God."

In other words, those who are "living in God" will learn how to live in their right relation to everything and to everyone else. As for the marriage

relationship, it will find its rule not in some text in the Gospels, but in the thought that they two will be steadfast to each other because steadfast in God. It is in this priority and supremacy of God's claim on us that Mr. Wells stands out as pre-eminently Christian. The duty to God is supreme; it comes first; the duty to man is second. He does not, like so many modern men, confuse religion with philanthropy. He says a remarkable thing:—

"Without God the service of man is no better than a hobby."

There is a breath of primal Christian insight and experience in that sentence. But he rightly balances it by another statement:—

"Many men and women are to-day doing God's work. They only need to change their orientation—they need but to become open and confessed servants of God."

His conception of the daily life of religion is work done "for God and by the power of God." His view of its duties is in line with the best Christian teaching of this age. He classes among essentially and pre-eminently religious occupations, research, teaching, creative art, and creative administration. His view of the origin of that life is essentially Christian. It begins with the consciousness of sin. "Sin is incidental separation from God." "Damnation," in which Mr. Wells believes, "is permanent separation from God." Salvation is found when the man escapes from the disharmonies of life into the kingdom of God. Damnation is the result of the failure to escape. Repentance is the turning to God in a spirit of faith that He can and will give salvation; turning with earnest prayer; and the consequent reception of moral and spiritual strength. Thus is salvation obtained. But constant prayer, watchfulness and dependence upon God for strength and enlightenment, are needful if salvation is to be retained.

Mr. Wells' attitude towards property is also essentially Christian. The Christian duty in regard to property is set forth, not in that dramatic interview, which ended with the words, "Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor," but in our Lord's parables of stewardship. Man is God's agent, God's steward.

In some of his views Mr. Wells has not a little in common with Liberal Churchmen. Mr. Wells declares his belief in a limited God. Liberal Churchmen are in general agreement with him there, only their way of viewing and setting it forth is different. The Divine Nature, regarded as transcendent or apart from creation, they hold to be omnipotent and infinite. But the creative process demands limitation. It can only be achieved on certain conditions, and by certain methods. The Creator selects the best of those methods, and enters upon the process voluntarily, accepting the limitations involved. Hence God as immanent in Creation is limited; He ceases to be omnipotent. The Incarnation, which is the most intense and concentrated form of Divine immanence, involves that extreme degree of limitation, which Christian theologians call Kenosis. God Incarnate has neither omnipotence, omnipresence, nor omniscience. Mr. Wells writing of himself and his fellow-believers, assures us, "Never more shall we return to those who gather under the Cross." We can but reply: "In this world a limited God treads the road to Calvary."

Liberal Churchmen and Mr. Wells are also united in their fear of organisation, sacerdotalism, and sacramentariansm. The Liberal Churchman recognises the need for a church, the need for a ministry, the need for sacraments, but he recognises also the deadly danger of them to religious faith and religious freedom. To each of the following statements made by Mr. Wells the Liberal Churchman can say a fervent *Amen*.

"The Church with its sacraments and its sacerdotalism is the disease of Christianity."

"All organisations must be watched for whatever is organised can be captured and misused."

"Before you know where you are, you will have exchanged the Spirit of God for *esprit de corps*."

"Repentance is the beginning and essential to the religious life, and organisations (acting through their secretaries and officials) never repent."

Yet if organisation and symbolism and art be kept in their place, *i.e.* "under God" and subordinated to the spirit of the religion of Christ, they may be of no little service to true religion.

Mr. Wells and Liberal Churchmen are also united in their fear of theological definition. Mr. Wells avers that in the three centuries preceding the Council of Nicaea, "the centuries of Christianity's greatest achievements and noblest martyrdoms, it had not defined its God." This is a half-truth but it is very suggestive. The Liberal Churchman shrinks from dogmatic definition chiefly for the reason that Butler shrunk from it. He doubts whether we have the faculties for it. He knows, moreover, the terrible dissensions which it has caused, and the false intellectualism of which it has been the parent in the religious life. Mr. Wells holds that it is "extraneous to religion and an impediment to religion." We agree with him, but we do not expect the dialecticians to agree with us. Howbeit, as St. Ambrose said, who according to Mr. Wells was "pitch-forked" into the See of Milan *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum.*

But Mr. Wells goes further than most earnest and educated Liberal Churchmen feel justified in going. "These creeds and articles and orthodoxies," he exclaims, "are not proclamations but curtains." Here, we think, he shews his lack of historic sense. They were proclamations once and now, for those who know nothing of history, they are curtains. We need new proclamations to-day. We need new creeds, and very simple ones. It is time for re-statement. The time for re-interpretation is past. But the old creeds do retain religious and theological values for those who can use them with knowledge, sympathy, reverence, and insight. To describe the Nicene Deity as "that stuffed scarecrow of divinity, that incoherent accumulation of antique theological notions," and the Symbol of Nicaea as that "misleading and ill-phrased Levantine creed," is really to expose in oneself the lack of those qualifications which are needful for the understanding and appreciation of the Nicene theology. And when Mr. Wells sternly forbids the Liberal clergy to recite the Nicene creed, and demands that the

shall resign their positions and cease their ministerial labours and openly do penance by publicly renouncing and denouncing that creed in their churches, we beg leave to reply, with all humility, that we must be guided by the judgment of those who know more about these things than Mr. Wells.

The cowardly "conforming sceptic" merits contempt, but the candid Liberal clergyman who, on the one hand, openly demands and strives for theological re-statement and liturgical revision, and on the other, continues faithfully to carry on the work of the great Christian institution into the ministry of which he believes it has pleased God to call him, is performing a difficult duty which, while it incurs from the one side the bitter hostility of obscurantist, traditional Churchmen, and from the other side, the contemptuous condemnation of non-Churchmen, whether Agnostics, Secularists, Unitarians, or Free Catholics, will, when the reforms for which he is labouring are accomplished, merit the gratitude of those that come after. The Liberal Churchman stands to be judged by the orthodoxy of the future, and by the Church of the future, and he can bide his time.

Mr. Wells recognises however, as we have done for years past, that :—

> "The time is at hand when many of the organised Christian Churches will be forced to define their positions either in terms that will identify them with this renascence, or that will lead to the release of their more liberal adherents" (p. 204).

But with that weakness in practical matters which marks all Mr. Wells' expositions he does not vouchsafe to reveal how these organised Christian Churches are to perform this necessary task rightly, if all liberal and modernist officers and adherents in them have forsaken their ranks.

Mr. Wells has studied science, he has also studied philosophy; if he would be perfect, let him now study history. It is Mr. Wells' strength, and it is also his weakness, that he is so much the child of his own age. A serious study of history will cure this defect. Historians believe in continuity; they believe in the power of education; they believe in the enormous influence of institutions; they believe in reforms rather than revolutions; they believe in the swing of the pendulum; they know the danger of casting out the babe with the bath-water, of rooting up the wheat with the tares. Let Mr. Wells cultivate something of their spirit and sympathy, and he will come to understand somewhat better than he does at present the temper and policy of the Liberal clergy for whom he now has such an immeasurable scorn.

Some years ago, we recommended young clergymen to read Mr. Wells' books, and we were duly castigated for doing so. Quite unrepentant we repeat the same recommendation to-day. He is well worth reading by all clergymen who would understand the tone and temper of modern England, and perhaps his latest book is at least as well worth reading as anything he has ever written. We may not agree with him in many things, but we have our faces set in the same direction as he, we are looking for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

> "It comes as the dawn comes, through whatever clouds and mists may be here, or whatever smoke and curtains may be there. It comes as the day comes to the ships that put to sea" (p. 206). H.D.A.M.

A MODERN CHRISTOLOGY.

The crying need of the present time is a sane and sound Christology. We want a theory of, or rather a belief in Christ, which, though it may not be entirely conformable to reason, is at least not repugnant to it. This belief must not only satisfy our speculative intellect, but also provide a solid basis for practical religion.

Mr. Raven has attempted to supply this need in his book, *What think ye of Christ?** It is a refreshing and stimulating work, original in its thought and unconventional in its language. The style is free from those facile phrases which often conceal a vagueness or poverty of thought.

Like two recent writers, the late Donald Hankey and Mr. Matthews in *Faith and Fear*, the author begins with a confession of faith, an *apologia pro vita sua*. He tells us in the introduction how he was led to examine his own beliefs, and how, later on, he was forced by circumstances to find an answer to give those who demanded a reason for the faith that was in him. These discussions convinced him that entire frankness was the only way of convincing the enquirer, and that the personality of Jesus was more important than the philosophy of the creeds.

He claims, as a Churchman, the right "to prove all things," and, if necessary, to restate accepted doctrines.

> "Our Church has always maintained the need of a reasonable faith, and always claimed the right to study, and if necessary, to restate that faith in accordance with the progress of human thought" (p. 26).

At the same time he insists that:—

> "Any real reform must be begun by way of a readjustment of belief. We must first work to secure the recognition and supremacy of Jesus in ourselves, and in our world" (p. 28).

The seat of authority is not the Bible nor the Church, but Christ Himself.

> "In Him we shall find our authority, an authority not derived from obedience to the infallibility of His recorded words and deeds, ... but secured through the surrender of ourselves to Him in love as persons to a Person" (p. 29).

The five lectures which follow deal with the conditions and consequences of the revelation of God in Christ.

Lecture I. considers the means and content of man's knowledge of God. God exists under two totally distinct conditions. On the one hand God is infinite and eternal; on the other, God reveals Himself in and through Nature.

> "We can apprehend, not indeed Godhead itself, but Godhead as mediated through the objects of sense-perception." (p. 8).

---

* *What think ye of Christ?* by Rev. Charles E. Raven, M.A., Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Macmillans, 1916.

We can rise sometimes by the mystic faculty to the vision of God, but such moments of close contact and communion are rare.

It follows that final and absolute truth is unattainable in religion.

> "It may be the closest approximation to truth of which human minds are capable; but it is not truth itself, and as such it cannot bring with it an authority of an absolute character." (p. 13).

This, however, is not a fact that should shock us, or shake our faith.

> "If we could realise God is His infinity, there would have been no need for Him to reveal Himself in Jesus." (p. 17).

The chief purpose of the Incarnation is that God should reveal Himself through the perfect man.

In past times the predominant view of God has been that of a transcendent monarch, sending His Spirit on certain select individuals. Now we lay stress rather on the immanence of the Godhead, which is in all men, especially in them that believe.

But the extent of the revelation is determined by

> "the ability of the particular medium to receive and transmit the knowledge of Him, and secondly, the ability of the recipient to accept the knowledge thus transmitted." (p. 27).

It is evident that all things and all men do not manifest God in the same degree. Even the saints, like S. James, S. Paul, and S. Peter, are very different in their characters and views of truth.

We dare not attach too much importance to the authority or the creeds of the Church. The *communis sensus fidelium*, or the collective experience of believers, should carry weight, but, of course, is not exempt from human error. We may, if we will, claim that the creeds are inspired, but certainly they are not infallible.

> "Our creeds define Him as He appears to human minds and can be described by human lips; they do not reveal Him as He is." (p. 34).

Again, the revelation must be conditioned by the environment in which it is given.

> "If God did appear in the flesh He would necessarily have to adapt His teaching to the outlook and intelligence of His contemporaries." (p. 36).

As Jesus appeared when and where He did, He was bound to use the current ideas of Messiah and Kingdom of Heaven with all their national and eschatological implications. He invested them with deep and original spiritual meaning, but did not, and, we may add, could not, dispense with them altogether for the purpose of His mission.

Lectures II., III., and IV., deal with different aspects of the nature and personality of Jesus. Mr. Raven begins by asserting the oneness of Jesus. He repudiates the traditional conception of a dual consciousness, and especially of "two wills" in the one Christ. He commends Bishop Weston for his book *The One Christ*, but regrets that he failed to bring the old into harmony with the new. Later on Bishop Weston is quoted as saying that in Christ there can be "only a single consciousness," but unfortunately he does not carry out this idea to its logical conclusion.

We find, in this lecture, a very clear and instructive sketch of the development of early Christian doctrine. There are two ways in which the problem of the Incarnation can be approached.

> "The first starts with Jesus Christ, considers His actions as they were known among men, and from them, and them alone, derives a conception of God" (p. 59).

That is also the inductive and scientific method.

> "The second starts with a conception of God derived from the general instincts of mankind, ... applies this preconceived notion to the historic Jesus, and interprets the nature of the Incarnation from this standpoint" (p. 60).

This is the deductive or scholastic method. The first is St. John's way, the way of the Christian religion; the second is the way of the Fathers, and of traditional orthodoxy, the way of the Church's theology.

There were three main types of early Christian thought about the Incarnation. The Jews interpreted the Godhead of Jesus as an indwelling of the divine, the spirit of the Lord in Him. The Orientals looked upon Jesus as a purely spiritual being. This view produced the Docetic Gnostics. The Greeks believed that Christ was the most exalted of mediators between God and man, yet not the supreme God.

The Jewish type was fully developed by the Antiochene theologians, Paul of Samosata, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and the rest. From the Greek type issued the Alexandrian school of theology, Clement and Origen, and after them Athanasius, Apollinarius, Cyril of Alexandria, and lastly the Monophysites. In early days the two schools have one striking feature in common.

> "While one party treats Christ as an inspired man, and the other as the incarnate word, both are agreed in representing the distinction between Him and other men as one of degree, not of kind" (p. 68).

To put it shortly, the Antiochenes laid chief stress on the manhood of Christ, and the Alexandrians on the Godhead. But the Alexandrians went sometimes so far as to deny any real humanity to our Lord. Christ was really incapable of feeling temptation or suffering. According to Apollinarius, Christ felt hungry only so long as He withheld His divine power by an act of will. This would reduce the temptation and suffering to a mere spectacular display.

The Antiochene school is best represented by Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia. He insists at every point on the reality of Christ's manhood, His growth in knowledge, His struggle against sin. Christ triumphed by the use of His free will, and lived a Godlike because sinless life. His relationship to God is to be explained in terms of love and will. The method of the indwelling of God in Christ is like the indwelling of God in His saints. For all men, if they love God, become to that extent at one with Him, and are enabled to do His will (p. 83).

But he was afraid of being accused of teaching, like Paul of Samosata, a progressive deification. Therefore he brings in the thought that God was always present with Jesus from His conception in the womb, and in

anticipation of His human choice of goodness. But, if His human choice was never exercised under our conditions, then the whole idea of a unity of will achieved through the right use of choice falls to the ground (p. 84). We can see that Theodore was right in assigning to Jesus the moral attributes of God, holiness and love, but he should have been able to conceive the working of God's will in and through our Lord without destroying the real freedom of His human will.

The strife between the two schools found its final issue in the Chalcedonian definition and, later, in the *Quicunque Vult*.

The whole difficulty lies in the choice of the wrong method.

> "We start with an assumption, and force the facts to fit our theory" (p. 97).

We ought, on the contrary, to start with the facts, and see whither they lead us (p. 100). This is the scientific and inductive method.

In Lecture III., entitled the many-sidedness of Jesus, Mr. Raven proceeds to an examination of the Gospels. He admits that some of the higher critics have failed no less than the conservative theologians from want of a sense of balance and proportion. They have freed themselves from the conventions of traditional orthodoxy to become enslaved to new and even less reasonable conventions of critical study (p. 105). But of course the general principles of criticism is necessary and indispensable for the discovery of the historical facts.

Mr. Raven follows the general lines of synoptic criticism, which are familiar, and acknowledged by most students of the New Testament to-day. He insists on the importance of St. Paul's Epistles, which have been called the Fifth Gospel, but says that they do not afford much material for the biographer of Jesus. The problem of the Fourth Gospel is discussed with fairness and acumen, and the points for and against the Johannine authorship are expounded with vigour. Perhaps the balance inclines on the side of the Johannine authorship, but in any case the value of the Fourth Gospel as a source is unquestionable. The Fourth Gospel acts as a corrective and remedy for the extreme tendencies of radical criticism.

> "In St. John our Lord is at once Jesus and Christ, actual and ideal, at once the Man whom the Synoptists described, and the Redeemer on whom St. Paul believed."

The weakness of modern theology has been due to the misuse of the dogma of progress by alternatives. Dr. Schweitzer has enunciated this dogma in an acute form by saying:—

> "Progress always consists in taking one or other of two alternatives, in abandoning the attempt to combine them."

But this theory cannot be applied to the person of Jesus. He appeals to all peoples and to all ages. His character is not simple and definite, but complex and many-sided, and we can enter into the spirit of the phrase of the early Alexandrians, who named Him "the many-coloured wisdom of God."

Lecture IV. leads on to the consideration of the divinity of Jesus.

> "The gist of the Christian claim is that in Jesus, in a man upon the earth, is to be found a reproduction of the divine." (p. 153).

> "We are struck by three aspects of Jesus—His freedom from the limitations of hereditity and environment; His readiness to spend Himself utterly in love for others; His claim to be at one with God as Christ, the Son." (p. 154).

First, He possessed the faculty of sincerity, of seeing things as they are. He saw through shams and hypocrisies, and was unfettered by traditions and conventions. Secondly, He was ready to give Himself, utterly and unreservedly, for others. By this complete self-surrender, even unto death, He inspired devotion and self-sacrifice in His disciples. Thirdly, He claimed to be, in some sense, Himself divine. There was in Him a consciousness of perfect holiness. While the best of men are most conscious of their imperfections, He was free from any sense of guilt.

We have moments of communion with God, but His union with His Father was complete and uninterrupted.

> "He transcends us as the perfect does the partial, as the image of God does those who are spoiled copies of that image." (p. 186).

And yet we must reckon the difference between Him and us, a difference rather of degree than of kind. He is very man, and His union with His Father is to be interpreted under the same mode as ours. It gave Him an unerring insight into the lives of His fellow-men, and an unfailing love for them. He is absolutely holy and loving, and so He is the perfect representative of God to man, because He is the perfect representative of man to God.

As to the pre-existence of Christ, we need not deny the pre-existence of the Logos, but we want to shift the emphasis to the Incarnation. If we accept our Lord as divine and as alive, the exact mode by which the Incarnation and Resurrection were effected, is comparatively unimportant. (p. 201). We should keep an open mind on these questions, whatever may be our personal convictions, and ought not to ban those who think differently from us, so long as we and they are agreed on the fundamental truths of the Christian faith.

In Lecture V., Man's salvation through Jesus, Mr. Raven examines the consequences of the modern doctrine of Jesus. The main test, as he pointed out before, of any doctrine is not "Is it true?" but "Will it save souls?" Our theology may be perfectly correct, but, if it does not touch the hearts of men and change their lives, it is sterile and unprofitable. Does this interpretation of the Incarnation lead on to any doctrine of the Atonement? Jesus is to man the supreme revealer of God, in His attributes of holiness and love. But the question may be asked, Can any true union between God and man be effected by a Jesus who will seem to some a mere man? This reminds me of a story told me of the theologian, Albrecht Ritschl. One of his friends said to him, "I am told, Ritschl, that you believe that Jesus was a mere man." "On the contrary," he replied, "I don't believe that my fellows are mere men." We believe that God's will is working in all men, and that there is something of the divine in every human personality.

In order to realise the need and discover the manner of salvation, we must start with the fact of sin. We may not accept the Fall story as history, but the fact of sin is patent and universal. How is a man to be delivered

from sin? The only way is the way of love. It is only those who love us, and whom we love, that have power to change our hearts.

"We are to give ourselves in love to Jesus, to reproduce through love His spirit in us, to share the mind of Him in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead in bodily form" (p. 219).

The Spirit of love which dwells in our hearts is the Holy Spirit. God in His infinite nature is the Father, God revealed in Jesus is the Son, and God revealed in us as individuals or members of the body is the Holy Spirit.

"He represents the immanent energy of the Godhead so far as this can be distinguished from the incarnate and transcendent aspects" (p. 226).

This is what is meant by the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. It is not Sabellianism, because Sabellius denied the permanence of the three modes of the divine Being, The three aspects of the existence of the Godhead are eternal, but each mode is not a separate self-determining entity.

The Holy Spirit, or Spirit of love, was revealed to us in Jesus Christ, and is transmitted to us as we come to know more about Him. The Holy Spirit makes us members of Christ, and also members one of another.

"Love, and love alone, can save us, and bind us together into unity with one another and with Christ" (p. 238).

The Atonement is generally expressed in the metaphor of sacrifice or ransom. There is truth in the idea of sacrifice, if it is rightly explained. The highest kind of sacrifice is self-sacrifice, especially when it does not shrink from suffering and death. The Cross of Christ is the climax of a life of service. He gave His life as a ransom, to free us from sin. His love breaks the power of sin, and sets us free to do God's will. We feel that the past has been forgiven, and that we can make a fresh start in life.

Mr. Raven ends his book with the inspiring words of a young French soldier, Alfred Eugene Casalis.

I conclude this review with two sentences from him.

"We ought to strive so that every will with which we come into contact may become a good will."

That is right, for only so can men become like Christ, because His will was, and is in perfect harmony with the will of His Father. And again:—

"The Spirit of Christ is a Spirit which lives, which develops itself, and is not fixed in a form always identically the same."

LEONARD PATTERSON.

THE RIVER OF DEATH.

Under the title, *The River of Death and other Allegories*,* has just been published a little volume consisting of selections from the writings of Lady Stapley, with a short foreword by Sir Richard Stapley, and a charming poem by Mr. Cloudesley Brereton. All who knew Lady Stapley will be glad to know of this, and to feel the spirit of her life breathing through the printed pages. Others too will find in the booklet much that is soothing and bracing. The continuance of the world-war is shrouding some in a kind of weariness

* Published by J. M. Watkins, 21, Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, London. Price 1/- net.

of spirit, and they are nigh to becoming obsessed by its manifold horrors and cruelties. Here is a voice that would call their attention away from mere observation in the outer world into the deeper regions of the true Being of man, where "He, and I, and thou, and every one have but one Life, one Nature, and one Name." Here is the recognition that at the head of things all is well, that the eternal goodness is for ever healing the broken in heart, binding up their wounds, and that unfailing Love is for ever turning sorrow into joy.

C.R.S.S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE CHURCH AT THE FRONT.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

The Archbishops have sent through the War Office a letter for chaplains to give to soldiers who are suitable for Holy Orders. We know that there are various signs that Church Reform is intended, but it seems to me a great pity that no reference is made in this letter to liturgical reform and doctrinal re-construction, for without it the very men we need as clergymen will be lost to us. Some of the chaplains have done heroic actions, but this does not make up for the failure of influence that their narrowness has rendered inevitable in too many instances. They fail because they will not sink or even suspend trivial views, and opinions, and practices which they have been taught to consider *principles*. In dealing with men facing death and wounds, hardship and suffering, our army chaplain's first essential is a full conception of the Divine love. Instead of this one finds an obstinate insistence upon the utterly non-essential, to say nothing of devotion to false principles and obsolete traditions.

It is pitiable, for after their fashion our chaplains are good men. But their influence, could they but realize it, is weakened with their men by insistence on lesser things, *e.g.*, insistence on vestments even in muddy dugouts just behind the front line; on extreme unction, on confession or refusal to hear confessions, on fasting communion, &c. I know one who was in quite a quandary because he had run short of priest's wafers. Another who has expressed to the officers of his unit his dislike of the presence at his services of Nonconformists who had no available chaplain of their own.

Early in the war a number of young chaplains at Rouen actually attempted to combine to refuse communion to all without previous auricular confession—fortunately this was nipped in the bud by a robust chaplain's outspoken coudemnation.

It is all incredible pharisaism! straining out gnats and swallowing camels, thanks very largely I suppose to their training. There are signs that after the war the laity are going to speak out; if this war does not open the eyes of the clergy great will be their fall, and worse still the fall of the Church of England.

SENIOR CHAPLAIN.

Manuals' Fund.—Donations received since May:—Rev. W. M. Teape, (South Hylton), £1 1s.; Miss Steele (Hereford), 10/-; Miss Hubbard (Steeple Claydon), 2/6; Miss Amy L. Hill (London), 2/6. Total, £235 7s. 6d. *Hon. Treasurer*, Mrs. REITH, Summerfield, Ilkley.

Conference of Modern Churchmen

CAMBRIDGE,

August 8—13, 1917.

Conference Committee:

Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.B.A.

P. H. Bagenal, Esq.
Rev. Cyril Emmet, B.D.
Rev. J. Gamble, B.D.
Rev. Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Mrs. Major.
Rev. C. Moxon, M.A.
Mrs. Moxon.
Miss D. Nussey.
The Dean of Carlisle.
Mrs. Reith.

The Conference this year will be held at Cambridge, where, by the kindness of the authorities, Girton College has been placed at the disposal of the Committee. The subject of the Conference will be THE CHURCH.

The arrangements are somewhat different from those of previous meetings. The Conference will begin on *Wednesday afternoon, Aug. 8th,* and will close on *Monday morning, Aug. 13th.* The programme proper will end on *Saturday, the 11th,* but it was thought that two extra days would be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

Tickets (including board and lodgings) will be **37/-** for the whole time, or **23/-** for three days, if paid before Aug. 1st, after which date the charge would be **5/-** more. Tickets for persons finding their own accommodation, **10/-**; for those engaged in tuition, **5/-**. Day Tickets, **3/6,** not including meals.

Meals.—Breakfast, 8-30; Lunch, 1-15; Tea, 4-15; Dinner, 7-45. Only a limited number of meals can be served to non-residents.

Horse Brakes for passengers and luggage will leave Cambridge station for Girton at 3-30, 4-30, and 5-30 p.m. Members wishing to have **Private Conveyances** may order direct from Mr. Cox, 49, Bridge St.

Bicycles.—In view of the distance from Cambridge (two miles), members may wish to bring bicycles, for which accommodation will be provided. All meetings will be held at Girton.

Tennis.—A small charge will be made for the use of the courts.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Press Secretary—P. H. BAGENAL, Harrogate.

After August 2nd all communications for the Hon. Secretary should be sent to Girton College.

The "Modern Churchman" Office, Knaresborough.

[P.T.O.

Cambridge Conference Time Table,

August 8—13, 1917.

Wednesday.—

6-0 p.m., Evensong, with Sermon by the Right Rev. Dr. MERCER (late Bishop of Tasmania).

9-0 p.m., Opening Address by Rev. Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Thursday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *Did Christ found the Church?*

The DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

Rev. J. R. WILKINSON.

5-0—6-45 p.m., *The Ministry of the Church—Its origin.*

Rev. ALFRED FAWKES.

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Ministry of the Church—Its functions.*

Sir William J. ASHLEY (Professor of Economics at Birmingham University).

Friday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *The Authority of the Church.*

Right Rev. BISHOP MERCER (Canon of Chester).

Rev. H. H. SYMONDS (Assistant Master at Rugby).

5-0—6-45 p.m., *The Spiritual Independence of the Church.*

The DEAN OF CARLISLE.

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Church and the Churches.*

Dr. CYRIL NORWOOD (Master of Marlborough).

Saturday.—

7-30 a.m., Holy Communion, with Address by the Rev. C. R. SHAW STEWART.

10-0—1-0 p.m., *The Church and the Sacraments.*

Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D.

Rev. C. F. RUSSELL.

Rev. A. P. PANNELL.

7-0 p.m., Evensong.

9-0—10-15 p.m., *The Church and the Fine Arts.*

Professor PERCY GARDNER.

Sunday.—7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

10-30 a.m., Mattins and Sermon. Preacher: The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

6-0 p.m., Evensong and Sermon. Preacher: Rev. Dr. RENDALL.

Monday.—7-30 a.m., Holy Communion.

[P.T.O.